



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/645,938	08/25/2003	Ming-Hsien Cheng	BP3022-J30-P30	8237		
7:	590 01/25/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
Ming-Hsien Cheng 235 Chung - Ho			CEGIELNIK, I	CEGIELNIK, URSZULA M		
Box 8-24	O		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Taipei,		3714				
TAIWAN			DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	5P	1
EN		
ess		
munication.		į
nerits is		
1.121(d). -152.		
age		

					/ 1			
		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/645,93	8	CHENG, MING-HSI	EN			
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Urszula M		3714				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by starely received by the Office later than three months after the made patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no even reply within the statutiod will apply and will attitute, cause the apply	nt, however, may a reply be tin tory minimum of thirty (30) day I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
Status	· ·							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)□	, -							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 2,4 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 2, 4, and 8-10 is/are rejected. 							
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form PTC	D-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ ' No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-	152)			

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 2 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of nonstatutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of US Patent No. 6,702,285 in view of Squibbs.

The patented and the pending claims set forth the same invention substantially the same scope except the game tray being triangular and having 28 adjacent slots arranged in seven lines. However, Squibbs teaches a triangular game tray that has a number of recesses (slots) arranged in a plurality of lines (see Figure 3, in this instance, the triangular game tray having five lines). Squibb further teaches that the number of lines is not limited to just a size composed of five lines, but may include other sizes having a different number of recesses (slots).

In view of Squibbs, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented game tray of claim 8 by providing triangular game tray having 28

Art Unit: 3714

adjacent slots arranged in seven lines, since Squibbs states at col. 4, lines 28-32, that bases of other sizes having a different number of recesses, and to increase the skill level of the game.

Claim 4, and 8-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of US Patent No. 6,702,285. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they set forth subject matters which are obvious over each other and only differ in breadth of terminology used. For example, the limitation "game tray" in claims 4 and 8-10 of the application is an obvious variation in meaning of the limitation "game frame" in patent claim 8 because the game tray and game frame are disclosed as being the same feature.

Response to Arguments

Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Art Unit: 3714

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Urszula M. Cegielnik whose telephone number is 571-272-4420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 5:45AM - 2:15PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris H. Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 for both regular and After Final communications.

Urszula M. Cegielnik Assistant Examiner

Art Unit: 3714

Art Unit 3714

DERRIS H. BANKS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700